Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): Sri Lanka Hybrid Report 2019-2021

This report was prepared in collaboration with Sachini De Fonseka, independent researcher.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The Open Government Partnership is a global partnership that brings together government reformers and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, responsive, and accountable. Action plan commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate an entirely new area. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments follow through on commitments. Civil society and government leaders use the evaluations to reflect on their progress and determine if efforts have impacted people's lives.

The IRM has partnered with Sachini De Fonseka, an independent researcher, to carry out this evaluation. The IRM aims to inform ongoing dialogue around the development and implementation of future commitments. For a full description of the IRM's methodology, please visit https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/independent-reporting-mechanism.

This Hybrid Report covers Sri Lanka's second action plan for 2019–2021. IRM publication on the national OGP process was delayed, as the current administration in Sri Lanka is yet to resume the OGP process and there was no OGP point of contact or points of contact in implementing agencies. Consequently, this Hybrid Report assesses both design and implementation of the action plan. It provides an independent review of characteristics of commitments and strengths and challenges of the action plan. It offers an overall implementation assessment that focuses on policy-level results. It also checks compliance with OGP rules and informs accountability and longer-term learning.

Starting in January 2021 the IRM began rolling out the new products that resulted from the IRM Refresh process.[1] The new approach builds on the lessons after more than 350 independent, evidence-based and robust assessments conducted by the IRM and the inputs from the OGP community. The IRM seeks to put forth simple, timely, fit-for-purpose, and results-oriented products that contribute to learning and accountability in key moments of the OGP action plan cycle.

---

[1] "IRM Refresh", Independent Reporting Mechanism, Open Government Partnership, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/process/accountability/about-the-irm/irm-refresh/.

II. Overview of the Action Plan

Sri Lanka's second action plan was designed through an improved, collaborative process. The commitments responded to citizens' demands and national development priorities. However, implementation of the plan stalled soon after its submission. Consequently, none of the commitments produced intended results. To remain in OGP, the government of Sri Lanka needs to restart the national OGP process.

2.1. General Highlights and Results

Sri Lanka joined OGP in 2015 and has since had two action plans. This report evaluates the design and implementation of Sri Lanka's second action plan for 2019–2021, which was developed under Sri Lanka's previous administration. Seven of the 15 commitments had moderate or transformative potential impact (47% of commitments), representing a downgrade from the previous action plan in which 16 of the 23 commitments were ambitious (69%). Only two commitments were substantially implemented (12%). Approximately half of commitments were not started (seven of 15 commitments), a higher portion than the previous action plan in which less than a fifth of commitments were not started (four of 23 commitments). None of the commitments produced notable early results for opening government, given limited implementation. Sri Lanka was found to be acting contrary to OGP process,[1] having not published a repository in line with IRM guidance[2] and fallen short of the threshold for participation during implementation of the action plan as required by the OGP Co-Creation and Participation Standards.[3]

Moving forward, the IRM recommends the following:

- Resume the OGP process, appointing a Ministerial and working-level point of contact (POC) and establishing the space for ongoing dialogue with civil society throughout the OGP cycle.
- Develop a new action plan in accordance with the priorities of the current administration and citizen needs, focusing on ambitious commitments that are resourced for implementation.
- Re-engage with the regional and global OGP platform, sharing lessons on open and good governance, and— with the OGP Support Unit—to access support to meet OGP standards and minimum requirements on participation and co-creation.

Overview of Design

The action plan's commitments addressed diverse policy areas, including commitments carried forward from the previous plan on health, the Government Information Centre, open data, the National Environmental Act, women's rights, anti-corruption, and the right to information. The action plan also included new commitments on disaster management, e-agriculture,

---

AT A GLANCE

Participating since: 2015
Action plan under review: 2019-2021
IRM product: Hybrid Report
Number of commitments: 15

Overview of commitments:
- Commitments with an open gov lens: 14 (93%)
- Commitments with transformative potential impact: 1 (1%)
- Promising commitments: 4 (27%)
- Completed commitments: 2 (12%)
- Commitments with major early results: None

Policy areas carried over from previous action plans:
- Public Health
- Access to Information
- Environment
- Rights of Women
- Anti-Corruption

Emerging policy areas:
- Disaster Management
- E-Agriculture
- Transportation
- Rights of Children
- Rights of People with Disabilities
- Public Participation in Local Government

Compliance with OGP minimum requirements for Co-creation:
- Acted contrary to OGP process: Yes

transportation, children's wellbeing, the rights of people with disabilities, and citizen participation in local government.

Although this action plan was less ambitious than Sri Lanka's first action plan, some commitments offered promising opportunities to open government. Under Commitment 2, an Office of Assets Disclosure and an online public portal for officials' asset declarations were to be established. Commitment 3 intended to expand access to information requests and proactive disclosures, as well as establishing a disabled-friendly information request portal and a government e-record management system. Commitment 9 planned for a consultative process to pass the Disability Rights Bill. Through Commitment 12, the action plan aimed to implement potentially transformative concluding observations of the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) by 2020.

The design process for this action plan saw stronger collaboration between the government and civil society. Sri Lanka's former government oversaw development of the action plan, with a more collaborative process than the previous action plan. Consultations were held in all provinces and with government and CSO stakeholders, including a qualified third-party monitoring, evaluation, and learning specialist.

Overview of Implementation

Following the presidential election in November 2019, implementation on the part of government almost entirely halted. The new government did not appoint an OGP focal point and did not follow through on implementation of the plan. For most commitments, minimal progress took place, although some sectors of civil society continued to implement certain milestones independently.

None of the action plan's promising commitments saw substantial implementation. Under Commitment 2, Transparency International Sri Lanka ran several campaigns on asset declaration, but the government did not establish an Office of Assets Disclosure or an online asset declaration portal. While there was localized progress on proactive disclosure, the remainder of Commitment 3's access to information initiatives were not undertaken. The Disability Rights Bill remained stalled (Commitment 9) and the intended CEDAW concluding observations were not implemented (Commitment 12).

The action plan made some progress on citizen involvement in transport and local government, without producing any substantial changes to government practice. Commitment 13 introduced citizen participation to three pilot local councils in the Western province. Citizens participated in these councils by providing proposals to the council budgets, submitting Right to Information requests as necessary, and serving as observers at council meetings and as members of the councils' standing and advisory committees as members. Under Commitment 14, the National Transport Commission surveyed passengers on their needs, as well as listing transport information and a complaints portal on its website.

---

[1] "Procedural Review", Open Government Partnership, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/procedural-review/.
[2] "IRM Guidance for Online Repositories", Open Government Partnership, March 2020, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-guidance-for-online-repositories/.
[3] Acting Contrary to Process - Country did not meet (1) "involve" during the development or "inform" during implementation of the action plan, or (2) the government fails to collect, publish and document a repository on the national OGP website/webpage in line with IRM guidance.

2.2. Noteworthy Commitments

The IRM acknowledges that results may not be visible within the two-year time frame of the action plan and that at least a substantial level of completion is required to assess early results. For the purpose of the Hybrid Report, the IRM will use the "Did it Open Government?" (DIOG) indicator to highlight early results based on the changes to government practice in areas relevant to OGP values. Moving forward, new IRM Results Report will not continue using DIOG as an indicator.

Section 2.2 focuses on outcomes from the implementation of commitments that had an ambitious or strong design, or that may have lacked clarity and/or ambition but had successful implementation with "major" or "outstanding" changes to government practice.[1] While this section provides the analysis of the IRM's findings for the commitments that meet the criteria described above, Section 2.3 includes an overview of the level of completion for all the commitments in the action plan.

Commitment 2: Asset Declaration System	
Aim of the commitment	This commitment aimed to increase public officials' asset transparency by establishing an Office of Asset Disclosure, publishing an annual report on relevant prosecutions, and creating and publicizing an online asset declaration portal. It built on a commitment with limited implementation in the previous action plan which aimed to amend the Declaration of Assets and Liabilities Act.[2]
	According to the Declaration of Assets and Liabilities Law, within three months of taking office, parliamentarians, judges, public officials of government departments, ministries, local authorities, chairpersons and staff of public corporations, candidates for elected public office, and elected officials were required to declare their assets and liabilities, as well as those of their family members.[3] Although this law had been in place since 1975, there were serious shortcomings in verifying disclosures and addressing non-compliance.[4] Preceding the action plan, most institutions did not adhere to legally-required asset declarations, and the system for asset declaration was paper-based.[5] Members of the public could only procure parliamentarians' asset declarations through a fee, and the law barred subsequently sharing this information more widely.[6]
	If fully implemented as written, this commitment could have had a moderate impact on increasing access to asset declarations. However, the commitment did not specify a process for increasing the number of officials declaring their assets. There was also a lack of clarity on corresponding actions to undertake prosecutions.[7]
Did it open government? **Marginal**	No progress was made on establishing an online public portal for asset declaration, an Office of Assets Disclosure, or annual reports on prosecutions related to asset declaration verification. During the beginning of the implementation period, Transparency International Sri Lanka and WSO2, a global software company, made a pro bono offer to develop the online public portal, but the government initially had a different plan for the portal, which did not come to fruition. Finally, the government did not conduct a public information campaign for citizens, but Transparency International Sri Lanka ran several campaigns on asset declaration. These included writing to members of parliament, publishing articles in the press, posting billboards, and creating social media campaigns. This brought asset declaration into the public discourse, generating a moderate level of demand for asset declaration among relevant civil society organizations and political parties.[8] As a result, by

| | February 2021, 12 individual parliamentarians had voluntarily published their asset declarations.[9] This was a positive step, but the remainder of Sri Lanka's 225 parliamentarians have not followed suit.

If future efforts are undertaken to establish an online portal for asset declaration, the IRM recommends incorporating efforts to increase the number of public officials declaring their assets, as well as including verification mechanisms to limit the falsification of assets declared or the obscuring of certain assets, such as beneficial ownership. It could also be valuable to include a redress mechanism for public feedback on the accessibility of relevant information and the usability of the portal. |
|---|---|

Commitment 3: Right to Information	
Aim of the commitment	This commitment intended to establish a disabled-friendly Right to Information (RTI) request portal and a government e-record management system. It planned for a 50% increase in RTI requests by August 2019 and a subsequent 75% increase by August 2020. It built on the previous action plan, which resulted in enactment and certification of the Right to Information Act in 2017 as well as appointment of an RTI commission.[10] The act was undergirded by Article 14A of the Sri Lankan constitution,[11] and is recognized by the Global Right to Information Rating as the best in the region and the fourth best in the world.[12] However, its implementation received limited attention from relevant government stakeholders.[13] Despite provisions on online proactive disclosure of information, Verité research found that the performance of 89% of public authorities was moderately unsatisfactory in this regard.[14]

The commitment had moderate potential for improving access to information. If fully implemented, it could have improved record keeping and accessibility of data regarding RTI requests and responses. Although the commitment's milestones were generally verifiable, it failed to clearly indicate how it would increase the number of RTI requests, improve public authority's responsiveness, or reduce limitations on usability and accessibility. |
| **Did it open government?**

Did not change | Under this commitment, a disabled-friendly RTI request portal was not established, nor was a government e-record management system, despite the statutory obligations of the RTI Commission. There was no centralized effort on improving proactive disclosure, although Transparency International Sri Lanka developed proactive disclosure websites for three local governments, and UNDP conducted complementary efforts. In terms of the number of RTI requests, this rate is not systematically measurable because there is no centralized portal. Transparency International Sri Lanka saw a reduction in the number of RTI requests facilitated through their organization's database during COVID-19, as in-person elements of the request process became more difficult. Meanwhile, responses to RTI requests were also delayed by the pandemic, given reductions in government staff.[15] Reportedly, information was released in response to requests in 79% of cases in 2020, falling slightly below the 84% release rate of 2017–2019.[16] The Right to Information Commission has not published annual reports since 2019. If this commitment is carried forward to a future action plan, the IRM recommends including an assessment regarding the quality of information provided. A public awareness campaign could also enhance citizens' use of a prospective RTI portal. |

Commitment 9: Disability Rights Bill	
Aim of the commitment	Through a participatory process, this commitment aimed to enact the Disability Rights Bill in alignment with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD), which Sri Lanka signed in 2007 and ratified in 2016. Previously, the Protection of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act was passed in 1996. The act does not account policy developments of the past 25 years, but passage of the new Disability Rights Bill has been stalled for over 15 years. With approval of the National Policy for Disability, a committee was first assigned to draft the bill in 2004. Successive administrations repeatedly redrafted the bill. However, it never progressed beyond the Legal Draftsman's Department.[17] Preceding the action plan, the draft Disability Rights Bill proposed establishing the Disability Rights Commission. This commission was to coordinate between people with disabilities, representative organizations, and governmental and non-governmental institutions. Its mandate was not to cover investigating violations or ensuring provision of justice and human rights for people with disabilities.[18] This commitment could have achieved a moderate impact on reforming disability rights, opening public participation for people with disabilities. People with disabilities are often marginalized by Sri Lankan society and denied full participation in the public sphere due to the absence of a legal, rights-based approach.[19] Progress on policies and regulations to provide equal rights stagnated after signing of UNCPRD.[20] Passage of the Disability Rights Bill could have rejuvenated outdated legal protections for a vulnerable population, although the commitment's plan did not address obstacles that had stalled previous iterations of the bill.
Did it open government? **Did not change**	Parliament did not pass the Disability Rights Bill. As of 2021, revisions of the bill were being undertaken by representatives of the National Council for Persons with Disabilities (NCPD), along with the Disability Organizations Joint Front (DOJF) and others. In terms of composition, the drafting group did not achieve a gender balance, and representatives were almost exclusively based in Colombo. The draft was only available in Sinhala, with an English summary prepared for the single Tamil representative. An attorney assigned by the Ministry of Social Welfare re-drafted the bill in August 2021, and faced a great deal of resistance from NCPD. That attorney attempted to shift responsibility for implementation of the bill from the Minister of Social Welfare to the Ministry Secretary, but was overruled.[21] Meanwhile, critics saw continued placement within the Ministry of Social Welfare as a means of maintaining the Ministry's financial allocation, and argued for placing responsibility for implementation with the presidency.[22] Moving forward, this draft bill could be strengthened by public consultations and appropriately legislating the implementation and monitoring mechanisms required by UNCPRD Article 33. Additionally, the Law Commission could be better placed to draft this bill, given its complexity.[23]

Commitment 12: Concluding Observations of the Convention on Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women

Aim of the commitment	The commitment sought to implement selected Concluding Observations of the Convention on Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) by 2020. It carried forward three commitments from the previous action plan on gender equality in state land distribution, non-discrimination in employment, and women's political participation. Milestones on a new Single Employment Law, Elections Law, and National Action Plan on Women Headed Households stipulated consultations with civil society, planning opportunities for participation in policy formulation. In terms of access to information, the commitment intended to accessibly publish online data on gender-segregated wages and sexual harassment, as well as consultation reports on the draft National Action Plan on Women Headed Households and the parliamentary gender quota.
	If implemented as written, this commitment could have achieved transformative impact on public participation for women as each milestone focused on a problematic area for gender equality in Sri Lanka. Although Sri Lanka elected the first female prime minster in the world, by 2019, Sri Lanka was ranked 181 out of 190 countries for women's participation in parliament.[24] A gender quota could introduce substantial political representation, given that women made up only 5% of parliamentarians (12 of 225) by 2022.[25] In terms of labor force participation, Sri Lanka had the 20th largest gender gap globally in 2018. As of 2019, the national female labor force participation rate stood at 34%,[26] with this rate stagnating at 30-35% for over two decades.[27] Preceding the action plan, over one quarter of Sri Lanka's households were headed by women, most of whom lacked access to employment benefits or adequate social protection mechanisms. The former Ministry of Women and Child Affairs began drafting the National Action Plan on Women Headed Households in 2017.[28] Regarding intended amendments to the Land Development Ordinance, CEDAW's concluding observations noted that as of 2017, draft amendments withdrawing discriminatory provisions on succession, joint ownership, and inheritance were still with the Legal Draftsman's Department, with progress stalled.[29]
Did it open government? **Did not change**	As of June 2021, the National Action Plan on Women Headed Households was not yet finalized. The drafting process had been slowed by the lack of a cabinet ministry dedicated to women's affairs in the current government, unlike previous governments over the past two decades. The women's affairs portfolio had been placed in a secondary state ministry, combined with child development, preschools, primary education, school infrastructure, and education services.[30] The Yeheliya Foundation, a CSO involved in this implementation, was not aware of consultations on the draft National Action Plan.[31]
	During the implementation period, women's and land rights organizations continued their two-decade campaign for equal land inheritance rights. A new Land Development Ordinance Amendment Bill was gazetted in December 2021. If passed, it would make devolution of state land titles gender-neutral by adopting terminology such as 'children' and 'grandchildren.' However, the amendment bill has been criticized by some women's rights activists.[32]
	In terms of the remaining components of the commitment, there has reportedly not been a new single-employment law with an equal pay provision. Sexual harassment committees were not established at government ministries. The Yeheliya Foundation undertook advocacy efforts to promote participation of women in politics,[33] but Sri Lanka did not introduce a parliamentary gender quota.[34]

[1] The IRM identified strong commitments as "noteworthy commitments" if they were assessed as having verifiable, relevant, and transformative potential impact. If no commitments met the potential impact threshold, the IRM selected noteworthy commitments from the commitments with moderate potential impact.

[2] "Sri Lanka End of Term Report 2016–2018", Open Government Partnership, 29 July 2019, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/sri-lanka-end-of-term-report-2016-2018/.

[3] "Declaration of Assets and Liabilities Law, No. 1 of 1975 (Incorporating Amendments up to 01st December, 2005)", Comission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery or Corruption, https://www.ciaboc.gov.lk/images/pdf/acts/Declaration_of_Assets_and_Liabilities.pdf.

[4] Palau and Brunei Darussalam, "Country Review Report of Sri Lanka", United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, https://bit.ly/3I9sjVZ.

[5] "Open Government Partnership Sri Lanka National Action Plan 2019–2021", Open Government Partnership, 3 April 2019, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/sri-lanka-action-plan-2019-2021/ (accessed 12 November 2021).

[6] "Shedding light on incomes, assets and interests in Sri Lanka", Transparency International Sri Lanka, 30 August 2019, https://voices.transparency.org/shedding-light-on-incomes-assets-and-interests-in-sri-lanka-39d0dae4df7a (accessed 4 January 2022).

[7] Asoka Obeyesekere, "MP Assets: RTI Changing the Rules of the Game?", Transparency International Sri Lanka, 3 February 2017, https://www.tisrilanka.org/mp-assets-rti-changing-the-rules-of-the-game/.

[8] Chathushika Wijeyesinghe and Sankhitha Gunaratne, Transparency International Sri Lanka, interview with IRM researcher, 15 November 2021.

[9] Uwin Lugoda, "Assets and liabilities declarations, the battle for transparency continues", The Morning, 14 February 2021, https://www.themorning.lk/assets-and-liabilities-declarations-the-battle-for-transparency-continues/ (accessed 5 November 2021).

[10] "Sri Lanka End of Term Report 2016–2018", Open Government Partnership, 29 July 2019, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/sri-lanka-end-of-term-report-2016-2018/.

[11] "The Constitution of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka", Parliamentary Secretariat, 2021, https://www.parliament.lk/files/pdf/constitution.pdf.

[12] "The RTI Rating", Global Right to Information Rating, https://www.rti-rating.org/ (accessed 4 January 2022).

[13] "Sri Lanka End of Term Report 2016–2018", Open Government Partnership, 29 July 2019, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/sri-lanka-end-of-term-report-2016-2018/.

[14] "Online Proactive Disclosure Under the RTI Act in Sri Lanka", Verité Research, December 2017, https://www.veriteresearch.org/publication/online-proactive-disclosure-under-the-rti-act-in-sri-lanka/.

[15] Chathushika Wijeyesinghe and Sankhitha Gunaratne, Transparency International Sri Lanka, interview with IRM researcher, 15 November 2021.

[16] "South Asia RTI laws are good but questions over effective use", ECONOMYNEXT, 27 October 2021, https://economynext.com/south-asia-rti-laws-are-good-but-questions-over-effective-use-87338/ (accessed 11 November 2021).

[17] Padmani Mendis and Binendri Perera, "Disability Policy Brief for Law Makers, Administrators and other Decision Makers", International Centre for Ethnic Studies, 2019, http://ices.lk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Disability-Policy-Brief-ENGLISH.pdf (accessed 3 December 2021).

[18] "UN Universal Periodic Review - Sri Lanka 2017", Disability Organizations Joint Front, March 2017, https://bit.ly/3CIDpAa.

[19] Ibid.

[20] "Enacting a New Law on Disability Rights in Sri Lanka", International Centre for Ethnic Studies, http://ices.lk/projects/enacting-a-new-law-on-disability-rights-in-sri-lanka/.

[21] Padmani Mendis, Advisor on Disability and Rehabilitation, correspondence with IRM, 10 December 2021.

[22] Padmani Mendis, "Disability rights a political issue", The Island, 10 August 2021, https://island.lk/disability-rights-a-political-issue/ (accessed 2 December 2021).

[23] Padmani Mendis, Advisor on Disability and Rehabilitation, correspondence with IRM, 10 December 2021.

[24] "Monthly ranking of women in national parliaments", Inter-Parliamentary Union, https://data.ipu.org/women-ranking?month=8&year=2019 (accessed 7 January 2022).

[25] "GENDER QUOTAS DATABASE", International IDEA, Interparliamentary Union, and Stockholm University, https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/gender-quotas/country-view/172/35 (accessed 5 November 2021).

[26] "Labor force participation rate, female (% of female population ages 15+) (modeled ILO estimate) – Sri Lanka", The World Bank, 15 June 2021, https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.TLF.CACT.FE.ZS?locations=LK (accessed 6 January 2022).

[27] "Factors affecting women's labour force participation in Sri Lanka", International Labour Organization, 2016, https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---ilo-colombo/documents/publication/wcms_551675.pdf (accessed 6 January 2022).

[28] Lihini Ratwatte, "Spotlight on Sri Lanka's Women-Headed Households Affected by COVID-19", The Diplomat, 4 June 2021, https://thediplomat.com/2021/06/spotlight-on-sri-lankas-women-headed-households-affected-by-covid-19/ (accessed 11 November 2021).

[29] "Concluding observations on the 8th periodic report of Sri Lanka: Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women", UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, 9 March 2017, https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1286137?ln=en#record-files-collapse-header (accessed 3 January 2021).

[30] Lihini Ratwatte, "Spotlight on Sri Lanka's Women-Headed Households Affected by COVID-19", The Diplomat, 4 June 2021, https://thediplomat.com/2021/06/spotlight-on-sri-lankas-women-headed-households-affected-by-covid-19/ (accessed 11 November 2021).

---

[31] Naushalya Rajapaksha, Yeheliya Foundation, interview with IRM researcher, 13 December 2021.

[32] Swasthika Arulingam, "The Land Development Ordinance Amendment Bill: Granting women the equal right to become landless", The Morning, 8 January 2022, https://www.themorning.lk/the-land-development-ordinance-amendment-bill-granting-women-the-equal-right-to-become-landless/ (accessed 15 February 2022).

[33] Naushalya Rajapaksha, Yeheliya Foundation, interview with IRM researcher, 13 December 2021.

[34] "GENDER QUOTAS DATABASE", International IDEA, Interparliamentary Union, and Stockholm University, https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/gender-quotas/country-view/172/35 (accessed 5 November 2021).

2.3. Commitment Implementation

The table below includes an assessment of the design and completion for each commitment in the action plan.[1] Please note that verifiability, relevance to open government, and potential impact were assessed at the design stage, before action plan implementation.

Commitment	Assessment:
1. Integrity Officers at Public Authorities	**Verifiable:** Yes **Relevant to Open Government:** Yes **Potential Impact:** Minor **Completion:** Not Started Integrity officers were not appointed during the implementation period. Under the previous action plan, the National Action Plan for Combatting Bribery and Corruption in Sri Lanka 2019–2023 was launched, requiring all public institutions to appoint an integrity officer. Their intended responsibilities were integrated into this commitment, including monitoring and reporting on bribery and corruption in their institution, ensuring employees' compliance with integrity related rules, and creating and managing a citizen's charter on the institution's services. Their responsibilities were also to include examining procedures and circulars in operation within the institution and where necessary, clarifying such documents. Additionally, they were to be responsible for appointing a facilitating officer as necessary, who could provide guidance to the public on obtaining services from the institution.[2] The previous government's Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery or Corruption received permissions for appointment of integrity officers. However, under the current government, implementation halted.[3]
2. Asset Declaration System	**Verifiable:** Yes **Relevant to Open Government:** Yes **Potential Impact:** Moderate **Completion:** Limited For details regarding the implementation and early results of this commitment, see Section 2.2.
3. Right to Information	**Verifiable:** Yes **Relevant to Open Government:** Yes **Potential Impact:** Moderate **Completion:** Limited For details regarding the implementation and early results of this commitment, see Section 2.2.
4. Citizen Participation in Health Sector	**Verifiable:** Yes **Relevant to Open Government:** Yes **Potential Impact:** Minor

	Completion: Not Started
	According to Sarvodaya, a key civil society stakeholder, the initiatives under this commitment were not implemented due to the new government's lack of investment in the open government process, exacerbated by a COVID-19 related shift in health policy priorities. This commitment intended to strengthen platforms for citizen engagement in health sector reform, carrying forward commitments from the previous action plan on chronic kidney disease and drug supply management. In terms of access to health information, there was very little progress on improving the Ministry of Health website and no communication campaigns on mental health or food-based research for chronic kidney disease.[4] As of November 2021, the Medical Supplies Management Information System still did not include Primary Medical Care Units.[5]
	The commitment did not accomplish its aims in terms of formalizing Sarvodaya and the People's Health Movement to improve public participation in health policy. However, both received some opportunities to participate in national health policy during the implementation period. In particular, during 2019, the Chairman of the National Medicine Regulatory Authority accepted the organizations' recommendations on operationalization of the National Medical Regulations Act passed prior to the implementation period. During the same year, their recommendations on the accountability of the health system were considered for amendments to the Constitution's fundamental rights chapter—although the process was dropped by the new government. During the pandemic, the Ministry of Health's COVID-19 response incorporated Sarvodaya and the People's Health Movement. Sarvodaya interpreted this as reflecting a degree of recognition of the importance of citizen participation in the health sector.[6]
	Moving forward, there remains a need to strengthen the People's Health Movement. Sarvodaya also recommends expanding government collaboration with civil society organizations in the health sector by building on the platform of the UN-convened COVID-19 health coordination mechanism, which currently includes the Ministry of Health, the WHO, and Sarvodaya. [7]
5. Child Substance Abuse	**Verifiable:** Yes
	Relevant to Open Government: Yes
	Potential Impact: Minor
	Completion: Not Started
	In February 2021, the Ministry of Education held discussions with the Ministry of Public Security on launching a School Drug Prevention Program.[8] Given a context in which substance abuse at schools is increasingly common,[9] this commitment planned to establish drug prevention committees at schools, composed of teachers, students, and parents. There is no evidence that this program has yet been launched or that the number of school drug prevention committees saw a marked increase compared to the number that existed prior to the implementation period.

6. GIC-1919, Government Websites, and Open Data Platforms	**Verifiable:** Yes
	Relevant to Open Government: Yes
	Potential Impact: Minor
	Completion: Not Started
	This commitment intended to carry forward efforts from the previous action plan to improve Government Information Centre (GIC – 1919), an online platform which publicly lists information on government services. There is no evidence that it achieved progress on GIC – 1919 or on government websites and open datasets. As of November 2021, GIC covered 288 government, elected, and corporate organizations.[10] However, the platform already covered 291 organizations in 2013.[11] In terms of accessibility features, the GIC website allowed users to adjust text size and colors. However, the website still included moving features that could not be paused, and it did not have adjustable background colors. Survey reports on citizen awareness of GIC services were not published on the GIC website.[12] Regarding www.data.gov.lkis, the website hosted 136 open datasets as of November 2021, falling short of the baseline of 300 datasets and the target of 2,000 datasets. The portal's last update was in February 2020,[13] indicating that the portal fell into disuse during the implementation period. Finally, there was no evidence that the planned assessment reports were published on the efficacy of government websites.
7. E-Agriculture Platform	**Verifiable:** Yes
	Relevant to Open Government: Yes
	Potential Impact: Moderate
	Completion: Limited
	In March 2021, the Ministry of Plantation Industries and the Ministry of Agriculture announced the development of the Agro Bizz – Smart Agro Integration Platform by Celata Tech (Pvt) Ltd. This initiative is contextualized by the Sri Lanka 2016–2020 e-agriculture strategy, which focused on integrating information communication technology and access to information,[14] but struggled with implementation.[15] The platform is intended to be used for management of farmers, farms, crops, fertilizer, pesticides, seeds, retailers, food processors, exporters, soil, agricultural water supply, and pest control. It will also be enabled to forecast crops yield, fertilizer requirement, and seed requirement, as well as managing financial aid and offering an online trading platform to directly link farmers and buyers without the need for intermediaries.[16] By the end of 2021, this platform had not been publicly launched. In terms of scope, only 67% of the population were mobile phone users, and 60% were internet users by 2021.[17]
8. Participation of Persons with Disabilities in Low Income Housing Allocations	**Verifiable:** Yes
	Relevant to Open Government: Yes
	Potential Impact: Moderate
	Completion: Limited

	Practitioners report no evidence of any steps taken by the Ministry of Housing or other government agencies to prepare a housing program for people with disabilities.[18] This commitment had intended to provide disability accessible housing to 3,200 low-income families by 2020 and to establish a National Housing Steering Committee, including people with disabilities in housing policy development and monitoring. In 2019, only 14% of people with disabilities were homeowners, and 70% experienced unemployment.[19] There remains an acute need for adequate accessible housing. Moving forward, if efforts are undertaken to introduce a government housing program for people with disabilities, the Institute of Human Rights advises consideration of proximity to schools, hospitals, transport, and public services. The Institute also recommends engagement of Housing Occupation Therapists in the program.[20]
9. Disability Rights Bill	**Verifiable:** Yes **Relevant to Open Government:** Yes **Potential Impact:** Moderate **Completion:** Limited For details regarding the implementation and early results of this commitment, see Section 2.2.
10. Participatory Disaster Management	**Verifiable:** Yes **Relevant to Open Government:** Yes **Potential Impact:** Moderate **Completion:** Not Started There was no publicly-available evidence of progress on this commitment during the implementation period. The commitment has aimed to introduce comprehensive disaster-preparedness programs and public early-warning systems through a consultative review and redesign of existing disaster management guidelines by the Ministry of Disaster Management and stakeholders affected by natural disasters. The Ministry of Disaster Management noted that the occurrence of natural hazards increased by 22 times between 2006 and 2016.[21] Moving forward, the success of an early warning system would depend on the availability of messages in all three languages, and efforts to ensure that people without mobile phones or who are not digitally literate are alerted as well. Other modes of communication should also be considered to enable access for all.
11. National Environmental Policy and Act	**Verifiable:** Yes **Relevant to Open Government:** Yes **Potential Impact:** Minor **Completion:** Limited This commitment is carried forward from the previous action plan, aiming to gather stakeholder recommendations for climate change adaptation and mitigation, to be integrated into a new National Environmental Policy and Act. This umbrella law was originally passed in 1980 and amended in 1988, 2000, 2018, and 2019.[22]

	After the end of the implementation period, a new National Environmental Policy was drafted, and was available for public comments in September 2021.[23] During the public commenting period, SYLCAN Trust held a virtual open dialogue on the policy, engaging experts to submit feedback.[24]
12. Concluding Observations of the Convention on Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women	**Verifiable:** Yes **Relevant to Open Government:** Yes **Potential Impact:** Transformative **Completion:** Limited For details regarding the implementation and early results of this commitment, see Section 2.2.
13. Citizen Participation in Pradeshiya Sabhas	**Verifiable:** Yes **Relevant to Open Government:** Yes **Potential Impact:** Minor **Completion:** Substantial Under this commitment, citizen participation was introduced into pilot local councils in Seethawaka, Millaniya, and Gampaha—three Pradeshiya Sabhas in the Western Province. Sri Lanka's 274 Pradeshiya Sabhas are the layer of local government situated closest to communities. Citizens participated in these pilot councils by providing proposals to the council budgets, submitting Right to Information applications as necessary, and serving as observers at council meetings and as members of the councils' standing and advisory committees as members. In terms of scaling up citizen participation outside of these pilot councils, with support from USAID and IDEA, this initiative has been replicated in three Pradeshiya Sabhas in the Northwestern Province—Karuwalagaswewa, Kobeigane, and Bingiriya. Additionally, through a directive from the Western Provincial Council, most local councils in the province now mandate participatory budgeting, incorporating ward-level proposals. In terms of the intended statute to strengthen Prajamandala at the provincial level, the statute was developed but not passed during the implementation period, as there was no elected provincial council.[25] There is need for continued efforts to expand citizen participation in local government, as well as introduction of a redress mechanism for citizen feedback regarding service delivery.
14. Improve Public Bus Transport Based on Passenger Feedback	**Verifiable:** Yes **Relevant to Open Government:** Yes **Potential Impact:** Minor **Completion:** Substantial In May 2020, the National Transport Commission began a survey targeting 2,000 passengers on passenger demands and requirements.[26] The outcomes of the survey were not publicly available. At the of this report's publication, the commission's website lists information on bus time schedules, routes, and fares. It also provides access to online bus reservations and a complaints portal that officially guarantees response within three business

	days.[27] Information on user-experience of the complaints portal is not publicly available. Future efforts to reform the transport sector would benefit from a focus on passenger needs and structural change. Institutionally, the sector could appoint a single governing body to make decisions regarding transport services, with consideration for public feedback.
15. Concluding Observations of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child	**Verifiable:** No **Relevant to Open Government:** No **Potential Impact:** Minor **Completion:** Not Started This commitment aimed to implement Concluding Observations of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), which Sri Lanka ratified in 1991,[28] but lacked relevance to OGP values or fully-verifiable milestones. There is no publicly-available evidence that the commitment strengthened Child Rights Protection Committees or resulted in a response to a study on the re-integration of institutionalized children. Regarding new policies, the National Child Protection Authority began to formulate a new policy on child protection. The drafting process included consultations on measures to prevent child abuse, violence against children, and corporal punishment. These consultations included the National Child Protection Authority, the Ministry of Women and Child Affairs, UNICEF, Sarvodaya, and other civil society organizations. However, progress was quite slow due to lack of political commitment to reforming child rights. Other obstacles included political volatility and difficulties with online meetings caused by COVID-19. Overall, according to Sarvodaya, child rights deteriorated over the course of implementation due to the pandemic, with school closures and increased incidence of child abuse, violence against children, and institutionalization. Moving forward, this policy area would benefit from strengthened citizen action and advocacy lobbying for government prioritization of child rights.[29]

---

[1] Editorial note: Commitment short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see Sri Lanka's action plan: "Sri Lanka Action Plan 2019–2021", Open Government Partnership, 3 April 2019, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/sri-lanka-action-plan-2019-2021/.

[2] "Integrity Handbook", Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery or Corruption, 2019, pp. 23–25, https://www.ciaboc.gov.lk/images/nap/1.-integrity-eng.pdf (accessed 29 October 2021).

[3] Chathushika Wijeyesinghe and Sankhitha Gunaratne, Transparency International Sri Lanka, interview with IRM researcher, 15 November 2021.

[4] Vinya Ariyaratne, Sarvodaya, interview with IRM researcher, 21 December 2021.

[5] "Medical Supplies Division", Ministry of Health, Nutrition & Indigenous Medicine Medical Supplies Division, 5 November 2021, https://www.msd.gov.lk/index.php/31-msmis-expansion-project.

[6] Vinya Ariyaratne, Sarvodaya, interview with IRM researcher, 21 December 2021.

[7] Ibid.

[8] "School children among 100,000 drug addicts in Sri Lanka", Colombo Gazette, 5 February 2021, https://colombogazette.com/2021/02/05/school-children-among-100000-drug-addicts-in-sri-lanka/ (accessed 11 November 2021).

[9] Radhia Rameez, "Not Just Pot Brownies: The Story Of Drug Use In Sri Lankan Schools", 6 November 2018, https://roar.media/english/life/in-the-know/not-just-pot-brownies-the-story-of-drug-use-in-sri-lankan-schools.

[10] "LIST OF GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION COVERED BY GIC", Government Information Centre, https://gic.gov.lk/gic/index.php/en/component/org/ (accessed 5 November 2021).

[11] "Government Information Center – GIC 1919 Annual Report", Government Information Centre, 2013, https://gic.gov.lk/gic/pdf/GIC_Annual_Report_2013.pdf (accessed 24 January 2022).

[12] "Government Information Centre", Government Information Centre, https://gic.gov.lk/gic/ (accessed 11 November 2021).

[13] "OpenData Portal of Sri Lanka", Information and Communication Technology Agency, updated 3 February 2020, http://www.data.gov.lk/search/type/dataset (accessed 5 November 2021).

[14] "Sri Lanka e-agriculture strategy – June 2016", Department of Agriculture, https://www.doa.gov.lk/ICC/images/publication/Sri_Lanka_e_agri_strategy_-June2016.pdf.

[15] Lionel Wijesiri, "Agriculture sector challenges and reforms", 16 December 2018, http://www.sundayobserver.lk/2018/12/16/thoughts/agriculture-sector-challenges-and-reforms.

[16] "New technical application introduced to save farmer and consumer from middleman", Business News, 27 March 2021, https://www.businessnews.lk/2021/03/27/new-technical-application-introduced-to-save-farmer-and-consumer-from-middleman/ (accessed 11 November 2021)

[17] Simon Kemp, "Digital 2021: Sri Lanka", Datareportal, January 2021, https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2021-sri-lanka (accessed 5 January 2022)

[18] Padmani Mendis, Advisor on Disability and Rehabilitation, correspondence with IRM, 10 December 2021.

[19] "Disabled persons and their right to own a suitable house", Daily News, 7 December 2019, https://www.dailynews.lk/2019/12/07/features/205021/disabled-persons-and-their-right-own-suitable-house.

[20] Ibid.

[21] "Disaster Risk Reduction in Sri Lanka: Status Report 2019", 2019, https://www.unisdr.org/files/68230_10srilankadrmstatusreport.pdf.

[22] Ananda Kannangara, "Importance of strengthening National Environmental Policy Act stressed", Daily News, 5 October 2021, https://www.dailynews.lk/2021/10/05/business/261031/importance-strengthening-national-environmental-policy-act-stressed.

[23] "Calling for Public Comments on the National Environment Policy 2021", Ministry of Environment, 18 August 2021, https://bit.ly/3q14Tf7 (accessed 5 November 2021).

[24] "Open Dialogue on the Draft National Environmental Policy 2021", SYLCAN Trust, https://www.slycantrust.org/open-dialogue-on-the-draft-national-environmental-policy-2021 (accessed 11 November 2021).

[25] Hemanthi Goonasekera, Federation of Sri Lankan Local Government Authorities, correspondence with IRM researcher, 14 December 2021.

[26] Pavani Hapuarachchi, "National Transport Commission conducts survey on Passenger Requirements", News 1st, 24 May 2020, https://www.newsfirst.lk/2020/05/24/national-transport-commission-conducts-survey-on-passenger-requirements/ (accessed 5 November 2021).

[27] "National Transport Commission", National Transport Commission, https://www.ntc.gov.lk/index.php (accessed 5 November 2021).

[28] Amanda Adamcheck et al, "The Implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Children in Seven South Asian Countries", Institutionalized Children Explorations and Beyond 7:1, 2020, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/2349300319894862 (accessed 7 January 2022).

[29] Vinya Ariyaratne, Sarvodaya, interview with IRM researcher, 21 December 2021.

III. Multi-Stakeholder Process

3.1 Multi-stakeholder process throughout action plan development and implementation

In 2017, OGP adopted the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards intended to support participation and co-creation by civil society at all stages of the OGP cycle. All OGP-participating countries are expected to meet these standards. The standards aim to raise ambition and quality of participation during development, implementation, and review of OGP action plans.

OGP's Articles of Governance also establish participation and co-creation requirements a country or entity must meet in their action plan development and implementation to act according to the OGP process. Sri Lanka acted contrary to OGP process.[1] Sri Lanka did not meet an "inform" level of public influence during implementation of the national action plan, nor did it publish a repository in line with IRM guidance.[2]

Please see Section 3.2 for an overview of Sri Lanka's performance implementing the Co-Creation and Participation Standards throughout the action plan's design and implementation.

Table [3.2]: Level of Public Influence
The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) "Spectrum of Participation" to apply it to OGP.[3] In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire to "collaborate."

Level of public influence		During development of action plan	During implementation of action plan
Empower	The government handed decision-making power to members of the public.		
Collaborate	There was iterative dialogue AND the public helped set the agenda.	✔	
Involve	The government gave feedback on how public inputs were considered.		
Consult	The public could give inputs.		
Inform	The government provided the public with information on the action plan.		
No Consultation	No consultation		✔

Multi-Stakeholder Process During Development

The co-creation process was led by the Presidential Secretariat, the government point of contact, and Transparency International Sri Lanka, the CSO point of contact. During the final stage of the first action plan, responsibility for the OGP process had shifted from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Presidential Secretariat, responding to CSO encouragement to select a ministry capable of driving domestic reform. According to Transparency International, the Presidential Secretariat was well-situated as a convenor, with ministries more likely to cooperate in response to invitations or circulars from the Secretariat.[4]

Development of the action plan offered greater opportunities for collaboration between government and civil society than the previous action plan. The first action plan was developed by CSOs and presented to the former OGP leadership at the Foreign Ministry, with minimal input from relevant implementing agencies. The plan was then passed through cabinet with few revisions. In comparison, the second action plan was developed with participation from relevant ministries, as well as CSOs, taking into account public feedback and input. The focal point assisted in raising public officials' awareness of the OGP process and encouraging attendance at provincial consultations.[5]

Commitments were designed based on the issues that arose during consultations in each of Sri Lanka's provinces. The nine consultations included government, civil society, and other stakeholders. The government focal point issued invitations and secured venues for these consultations, as well as attending seven of them. The consultations utilized a new practice for Sri Lanka, engaging a third-party specialist as a convener. This approach contributed to collaborative thinking and greater buy-in from implementing agencies.[6] No validation consultations were conducted at the provincial-level due to time constraints, as the action plan was delayed by a year, shifting its implementation period to 2019-2021. Following the nine consultations, meetings focused mainly on development of commitment milestones. The process began with a review of the previous action plan, including all participating government bodies and CSOs. CSOs and ministry counterparts collaborated to co-create and finalize commitments. The action plan was then published on the Sri Lankan OGP website for public comments, and feedback was incorporated.[7] The Cabinet of Ministers approved implementation of the second national action plan, which was presented by the former president in January of 2019.[8]

Multi-Stakeholder Process During Implementation

During the first quarter of the implementation period, relevant government agencies began implementation and submitted their first quarterly monitoring and evaluation reports. However, following the presidential election in November 2019, implementation on the part of government agencies almost entirely halted. The new government deprioritized engagement in the open government process, did not appoint an OGP focal point, and did not reply to most civil society requests for meetings on the action plan. Minimal progress took place in government implementation of the action plan, with little continued government awareness of the action plan's existence. Some sectors of civil society continued to implement certain commitment milestones independently.[9]

---

[1] Acting Contrary to Process - Country did not meet (1) "involve" during the development or "inform" during implementation of the NAP (2) government fails to collect, publish and document a repository on the national OGP website/webpage in line with IRM guidance.

[2] "IRM Guidance for Online Repositories", Open Government Partnership, March 2020, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-guidance-for-online-repositories/.

[3] "IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum", IAP2, 2014, https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/pillars/Spectrum_8.5x11_Print.pdf.

[4] Chathushika Wijeyesinghe, Program Officer – Open Government Partnership, Transparency International Sri Lanka, interview by IRM researcher, 7 October 2020.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Sankhitha Gunaratne, Deputy Executive Director, Senior manager programmes – Transparency International Sri Lanka.

[8] "Decisions taken by the Cabinet of Ministers at its meeting held on 22.01.2019", news.lk,23 January 2019, https://www.news.lk/cabinet-decusions/item/23866-decisions-taken-by-the-cabinet-of-ministers-at-its-meeting-held-on-22-01-2019.

[9] Chathushika Wijeyesinghe and Sankhitha Gunaratne, Transparency International Sri Lanka, interview with IRM researcher, 15 November 2021.

3.2 Overview of Sri Lanka's performance throughout action plan implementation

Key:
Green= Meets standard
Yellow= In progress (steps have been taken to meet this standard, but standard is not met)
Red= No evidence of action

Multi-stakeholder Forum	During Development	During Implementation
1a. Forum established: The multi-stakeholder forum consisted of government and CSO representatives oversaw development of the action plan. It became inactive during the implementation period.	Green	Red
1b. Regularity: The forum met several times during the co-creation process which lasted around six months, and did not meet during the implementation period.	Yellow	Red
1c. Collaborative mandate development: The IRM did not find evidence that members of the forum jointly develop its remit, membership and governance structure.	Red	N/A
1d. Mandate public: Information on the forum's remit, membership and governance structure was not available on the national OGP website.	Red	Red
2a. Multi-stakeholder: The forum included both governmental and non-governmental representatives.	Green	Red
2b. Parity: There were an equal number governmental and non-governmental stake holders involved, but decision-making power was unevenly balanced.	Yellow	Red
2c. Transparent selection: The IRM did not find evidence on whether non-governmental members of the forum were selected through a fair and transparent process.	Red	N/A
2d. High-level government representation: The forum included high-level government representation, with the secretary or the additional secretary to the ministry participating. During implementation, the government ceased participation.	Green	Red
3a. Openness: During the design process, there were consultations conducted in nine districts that included input from CSOs and other stakeholders. During implementation, the forum did not convene or accept input and representation on the action plan implementation from any civil society and other stakeholders outside the forum.	Green	Red
3b. Remote participation: The IRM did not find evidence of opportunities for remote participation.	Red	Red

3c. Minutes: The OGP forum did not proactively communicate and report back on its decisions, activities, and results to wider government and civil society stakeholders	Red	Red

Action Plan Development[1]	
4a. Process transparency: A page of the presidential secretariat website is allocated for the OGP process, but the page was not updated on progress.[2]	Red
4b. Documentation in advance: The IRM did not find evidence that the forum shared information about OGP to stakeholders in advance to guarantee they were informed and prepared to participate in all stages of the process.	Red
4c. Awareness raising: During the design process, outreach and awareness-raising activities with relevant stakeholders were conducted in order to inform them of the OGP process.	Yellow
4d. Communication channels: The OGP website listed an email to facilitate submissions to the design process, and several meetings were held during the development of the second national action plan. Direct communication between government and civil society did not continue during implementation of the action plan.	Yellow
4e. Reasoned response: There were public consultations at the beginning of the development process, but the government did not publish sufficient reasoned response to public comments.	Yellow
4f. Repository: The government did not document, collect, and publish a repository on the national OGP website in line with IRM guidance.	Red

Action Plan Implementation[3]	
5a. Process transparency: A page of the presidential secretariat website is allocated for the OGP process, but the page was not updated on progress of commitments.[4] A self-assessment report was not published.	Red
5b. Communication channels: Direct communication between government and civil society halted during implementation of the action plan.	Red
5c. Engagement with civil society: The government did not engage with civil society during implementation of the action plan.	Red
5d. Cooperation with the IRM: The IRM did not separately publish a Design Report for this action plan, as the current administration in Sri Lanka is yet to resume the OGP process, and there was no OGP point of contact or points of contact in implementing agencies.	N/A

5e. MSF engagement: The multi-stakeholder forum did not monitor and deliberate on how to improve implementation of the action plan.	Red
5f. MSF engagement with self-assessment report: The government did not submit an end-of-term self-assessment report.	Red
5g. Repository: The government did not document, collect, and publish a repository on the national OGP website in line with IRM guidance.	Red

---

[1] Editorial Note: Compared to Action Plan Development tables in previous design reports, this table has been renumbered for consistency within this Hybrid Report. Items are numbered for internal purposes.

[2] "OGP", Presidential Secretariat, https://www.presidentsoffice.gov.lk/index.php/ogp/ (accessed 28 January 2022).

[3] Editorial Note: Compared to Action Plan Implementation tables in previous Transitional Results Reports, this table has been renumbered for consistency within this hybrid report. Items are numbered for internal purposes.

[4] "OGP", Presidential Secretariat, https://www.presidentsoffice.gov.lk/index.php/ogp/ (accessed 28 January 2022).

IV. Methodology and Sources

The indicators and method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual.[1] The following summarizes key indicators assessed by the IRM:

- **Verifiability:**
  - o "Yes" Specific enough to review: As written in the action plan, the objectives stated and actions proposed are sufficiently clear and includes objectively verifiable activities to assess implementation.
  - o "No" Not specific enough to review: As written in the action plan the objectives stated and proposed actions lack clarity and do not include explicit verifiable activities to assess implementation.
    - ▪ Commitments that are not verifiable will be considered "not reviewable", and further assessment will not be carried out.
- **Relevance to Open Government:** This variable evaluates the commitment's relevance to OGP values. Based on a close reading of the commitment text as stated in the action plan, the guiding questions to determine the relevance are:
  - o Access to Information: Will the government disclose more information or improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public?
  - o Civic Participation: Will the government create or improve opportunities or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions or policies?
  - o Public Accountability: Will the government create or improve public facing opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions?
  - o Technology & Innovation for Transparency and Accountability: Will technological innovation be used in conjunction with one of the other three OGP values to advance either transparency or accountability?
- **Potential impact** This variable assesses the potential impact of the commitment, if completed as written. The IRM researcher uses the text from the action plan to:
  - o Identify the social, economic, political, or environmental problem;
  - o Establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan; and
  - o Assess the degree to which the commitment, if implemented, would impact performance and tackle the problem.
- **Completion:** This variable assesses the commitment's implementation and progress. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle. For each commitment, this variable is assessed as: no evidence available, not started, limited, substantial, or complete.
- **Did It Open Government?:** This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how the government practice, in areas relevant to OGP values, has changed as a result of the commitment's implementation. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle. This variable is assessed as: did not change, marginal, major, or outstanding.

This report highlights outcomes from the implementation of commitments that had an ambitious or strong design, or that may have lacked clarity and/or ambition but had successful implementation with "major" or "outstanding" changes to government practice.

This review was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with Sachini De Fonseka and overseen by the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP). For more information about the IRM refer to the **"About IRM" section of the OGP website** available [here](#).

---

[1] "IRM Procedures Manual", OGP, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual.